

## **Scoring Tips**

Page 1 of 2

---

Potential applicants should not be discouraged if this competitive process seems very demanding and to require a lot of work, effort, data, information, and expertise. Do not be discouraged. Just do your reasonable best, send the application to us, and we will have it reviewed. You cannot get a grant if you do not try.

### **General Match 75% Funding.**

The 75% scoring is on a zero to 110 scale.

The reviewers of Direct Services, Training, and Other projects use the identical two scoring pages for each of these three types of projects. The two scoring pages used are for the: (1) Justification (maximum of 11.11 points), and (2) Statutory Considerations (maximum of ten points) parts of the application form.

However, most points are in the outcome section of the application form, and its credibility (maximum of 88.89 points). The outcome forms are different for Direct Services, Training, and Other projects.

Do your best on all parts of the application form, but you cannot get a high total score for a 75% grant without a substantial and credible outcome section.

### **Rural Match 90% Funding.**

When we review a rural application for a 75% general matching grant, we must use the scoring process for the 75% grant program described above under the General Match section. When the same rural application is reviewed for a rural grant, (90% funding) we must use different standards, as described below.

The rural grant standard is the likelihood, based upon the information provided by the applicant that in the next 12 months the lives and health of the population served will be adversely affected without the requested resources. The reviewers use a five point scale, shown below, and any score between zero and five may be used (e.g. .5, 1.25, 2.0, 2.5, 3.5, 4, 4.5, etc.), but none greater than 5.

The specific scale follows, but any fractional score in the 0 to 5 range may be assessed by reviewers.

5. High likelihood the resources will be needed,
3. Medium likelihood
1. Low likelihood
0. Not sufficiently established in the information provided

Keep in mind the rural standard is the likelihood of benefit to the victims of emergencies. Any other aspect such as describing the organizational economic situation or the condition of existing equipment could serve to place the situation in perspective outside of what are the formal criteria, but the approach should focus strongly on the effect of the project upon the well-being of the people being served.

Obviously, 90 percent funding is better than 75 percent funding, but the amount for the 90 percent rural grants is a maximum of ten percent of all award funds available, so the resources are relatively small for 90 percent funding. In the previous grant cycle, we awarded only three 90 percent grants, but 42 projects (including 12 rural) received 75 percent grants. Of course, replacement projects are not eligible for the 75 percent grants, but if a rural project is not replacement the chances of some funding is greater under both percentages of funding.